POLITICAL DELIBERATION
COMMUNICATION 555 (WINTER 2006)

Professor: John Gastil
Office: CMU 331  Phone: 543-4665 (cell: 206-384-1288)
Email: jgastil@u.washington.edu
Office hours: by appointment

COURSE SUMMARY
This course reviews recent theory and research on political deliberation in a wide range of settings ranging from small group discussions to large-scale public forums to print, electronic, and on-line media. The course’s primary objective is to teach you how to read and write empirical research on public deliberation. After completing the course, you should be familiar with many current perspectives on deliberation, you will better understand the relationship between moral claims, empirical claims, and research, and you will know how to complete a scholarly research paper.

PROJECTS
This course is what I call a “project-based seminar.” The nine students taking this seminar are working on six discrete projects. You will learn at least as much by doing your project and observing your colleagues work through theirs as you will from doing the readings and discussing them in class. The entire course is designed to ensure the successful completion of these six projects. (Note that the end of the reading list has a section showing previous writings based on datasets used in A1, A3, and B1-2.

Project A1. Gender and a student discussion of sexual harassment (Amoshaun Toft & Brandon Bosch)
Project A2. Patterns of attitude change in deliberative polling (Chiara Bacci & Michael Dollinger)
Project A3. Citizen deliberation on initiatives (Chris Wells & Justin Reedy)
Project B1. How jurors describe jury service (Leah Sprain)
Project B2. Diversity and the jury experience (Andrea Hickerson)
Project B3. Experts and citizen deliberation at public meetings (Kevin Ramsey)
Project B4. Comparison of deliberative methods or other project TBA (Ian Conway)

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING
The bulk of your grade will be based on the quality of a scholarly article or research proposal you write during the quarter. This paper will be the synthesis and extension of six short pieces written throughout the quarter. On-time and satisfactory completion of each of the six papers accounts for 5% of your final grade, and the overall quality of the final paper accounts for 50% of the final grade. The emphasis in the short papers is clear and complete exposition of ideas/methods, whereas I evaluate the final paper using the full set of criteria of any scholarly reviewer, including scholarly rigor, organization, quality of writing, effective use of references, formatting style, etc.

Participation in class accounts for the remaining 20% of each student’s grade. Half of the participation grade comes from the on-time satisfactory completion of one-page reaction papers, with the other half coming from active and helpful participation in class discussions.
## Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discussion Topic</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 3</td>
<td>Overview of Quarter</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5</td>
<td>Philosophical origins</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>National Issues Forums</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12</td>
<td>Projects: Sample and data features</td>
<td>1-2 page summary of dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17</td>
<td>Deliberative Polling</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19</td>
<td>Deliberative elections and WA-CIR</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24</td>
<td>The Civic Impact of Jury Deliberation</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26</td>
<td>Cultural difference and deliberation</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>Citizens, experts, and elected officials</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2</td>
<td>Projects: Hypothesized variable relationships</td>
<td>2-3 page specification of hypotheses (direction and magnitude), with diagrams if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>Citizens Jury and Assembly Processes</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9</td>
<td>Projects: Theoretical justification and relevance of hypotheses</td>
<td>2-3 page justification of hypotheses with references; explains why results could be expected and their importance for deliberation research/practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>Mediated deliberation and public journalism</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16</td>
<td>Projects: Data and operationalization</td>
<td>2-3 page description of operational methods with descriptive stats and notes (power, reliability, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>Deliberation Day</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>Projects: Statistical approach</td>
<td>1-2 page description of what statistical methods will test each hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Macro deliberation: Bringing together different deliberative forms</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>International deliberation</td>
<td>Readings and reaction page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>Projects: Analyses for A1-A3</td>
<td>3-5 pages summarizing results of statistical tests of hypotheses, including tables/figures as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>Projects: Analyses for B1-B4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td>Combine writings into final paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
READINGS

The required readings will be available in a reading packet at Ram’s Copy Shop (4144 University Way NE, Seattle, Washington - Phone: 206-632-6630). I have PDF or book copies of many of the other readings, which are simply provided here to aid your specific projects or future reference.

JANUARY 5  PHILOSOPHICAL ORIGINS

Required readings

Further reading
JANUARY 10 NATIONAL ISSUES FORUMS

Required readings


Further reading


JANUARY 17 DELIBERATIVE POLLING

Required readings


Further reading
Various papers posted online at the Center for Deliberative Democracy website--

JANUARY 19    DELIBERATIVE ELECTIONS AND WA-CIR

Required readings
Description of CIR at http://www.cirwa.org.

Further reading
JANUARY 24 CIVIC IMPACT OF JURY DELIBERATION

Required reading


Further reading


---

**JANUARY 26**

**CULTURAL DIFFERENCE AND DELIBERATION**

Required reading


Further reading


Required reading

Further reading


---

**FEBRUARY 7  CITIZENS JURY AND ASSEMBLY PROCESSES**

**Required readings**


**Further reading**


---

**FEBRUARY 14  MEDIATED DELIBERATION**

**Required readings**


Further reading


FEBRUARY 21  DELIBERATION DAY

Required readings

Further reading

FEBRUARY 28  MACRO DELIBERATION: BRINGING TOGETHER DIFFERENT DELIBERATIVE FORMS

Required readings
Further reading


---

MARCH 2

INTERNATIONAL DELIBERATION

Required readings


Further reading


ARTICLES USING EXISTING DATASETS

Project A1: Gender and a student discussion of sexual harassment

Project A2: Novel dataset derived from previous deliberative polls.

Project A3: Citizen deliberation on initiatives

Project B1-2: Juries

Project B3: Novel dataset derived from Jan 2006 focus groups; also, this seminar project may yield a research proposal rather than a data analytic paper.

Project B4: Novel project, possibly a critical literature review or other analysis, or perhaps utilizing existing datasets.